UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,923	02/21/2002	Carl W. Orthlieb	07844-518001/P480	7784

21876 7590 11/03/2005		EXAMINER
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.		REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A
P.O. Box 1022		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *2/21/02* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *see attached*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on August 14, 2003 is in

compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is

considering the information disclosure statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schull,

U.S. Patent 5,509,070.

As per claims 1 and 27, Schull discloses of a method and a user software

application, tangibly stored on a computer-readable medium for controlling capabilities

of a user software application, comprising providing a user software application, the

user software application including a set of disabled operations; receiving content

capable of being operated on by one or more of the disabled operations in the set of

disabled operations; receiving application rights information operable to enable an

operation in the set of disabled operations to operate on content within a context

specified in the application rights information; and enabling the operation in the set of disabled operations to operate on the received content (col. 3, line 49 through col. 4, line 35).

As per claims 2 and 28, Schull teaches that the application rights information is received with the content on which the operation is to be performed (col. 3, lines 49-59).

As per claims 3,7, and 29, it is disclosed by Schull that wherein the content is content of an electronic document and the application rights information is embedded in the document (col. 3, lines 49-59).

As per claims 4 and 31, Schull teaches wherein the application rights information and the content on which the operation is to be performed are received separately (col. 3, lines 49-59).

As per claims 5 and 32, Schull discloses wherein the content is content of an electronic document and the operations in the set of disabled operations include adding content to the document (col. 11, lines 60-67).

As per claims 6 and 33, Schull teaches wherein the document is a PDF document (col. 1, lines 17-32).

As per claim 8 and 30, Schull teaches unpacking the application rights information from the document (col. 6, lines 6-11).

As per claims 9 and 34, Schull discloses wherein the context specified in the application rights information includes a particular document (col. 1, lines 17-32).

As per claims 10 and 35, Schull teaches wherein the particular state of the particular document in a particular state is defined by a user (col. 4, lines 17-26).

As per claims 11 and 36, Schull discloses wherein the application rights information associated with the received content is different for different contexts (col. 3, lines 49-59).

As per claims 12 and 37, Schull teaches of saving the application rights information on a computer hosting the computer software application (col. 16, lines 5-20).

As per claims 13 and 38, Schull discloses wherein receiving application rights information comprises querying a database for application rights information; and receiving application rights information from the database in response to the query (col. 3, lines 49-59).

As per claims 14 and 39, Schull teaches wherein the content has one or more associated permissions restricting what operations can be performed on the content (col. 3, lines 49-59).

As per claims 15 and 40, Schull discloses of a method and content provider software application, tangibly stored on a computer-readable medium for providing content to be operated on by a user software application, comprising generating content in a format compatible with a user software application, the user software application including a set of disabled operations; generating application rights information for the content, the application rights information being operable to enable an operation in the set of disabled operations to operate on the content within a context

specified in the application rights information; and distributing the content and the application rights information to one or more users (col. 3, line 49 through col. 4, line 35).

As per claims 16 and 41, Schull teaches of associating the generated application rights information with the generated content (col. 3, lines 49-59).

As per claims 17 and 42, Schull discloses of monitoring one or more of to how many users the application rights information is distributed, the operations enabled for each user, the context in which the operations are enabled for each user, and the number of enabled operations performed by users to whom the content and application rights have been distributed (col. 3, line 49 through col. 4, line 35).

As per claims 18 and 43, Schull teaches of providing an accounting to a user software application provider based on one or more of the number of users to which the application rights information has been distributed, the operations enabled for each user, the context in which the operations are enabled for each user, and the number of enabled operations performed by users to whom the content and application rights have been distributed (col. 3, line 49 through col. 4, line 35).

As per claims 19 and 44, Schull discloses of providing an accounting to a user software application provider based on the context specified in the application rights information distributed to the users (col. 3, lines 49-59).

As per claims 20 and 45, Schull teaches that wherein the content is content of an electronic document and wherein the step of associating comprises embedding the application rights information in the document (col. 3, lines 49-59).

As per claims 21 and 46, Schull discloses of a method and system for providing a

configurable, context-dependent user software application, comprising providing a user

software application, the user software application including a set of disabled

operations, the user software application being operable to enable an operation in the

set of disabled operations to operate on received content based on application rights

information; providing a content generation tool, the content generation tool being

operable to generate content in a format compatible with the user software application;

and generate application rights information for the content, the application rights

information identifying one or more operations in the set of disabled operations and

being operable to cause the user software application to enable the identified

operations; distributing the user software application to one or more users; and

distributing the content generation tool to one or more content providers for use in

generating content and application rights information to be distributed to one or more of

the users (col. 3, line 49 through col. 4, line 35).

As per claims 22 and 47, Schull teaches wherein the content generation tool

further is operable to associate the application rights information with the content (col.

3, lines 49-59).

As per claims 23 and 47, Schull discloses wherein the application rights

information is operable to cause the user software application to enable the identified

operations within a context specified in the application rights information (col. 3, lines

49-59).

As per claims 24 and 48, Schull teaches of receiving information from a content provider about one or more of the number of users to which the application rights information has been distributed, the operations enabled for each user, the context in which the operations are enabled for each user, and the number of enabled operations performed by users to whom the content and application rights have been distributed (col. 3, line 49 through col. 4, line 35).

As per claims 25 and 49, Schull discloses of receiving an accounting from a content provider based on one or more of the number of users to which the application rights information has been distributed, the operations enabled for each user, the context in which the operations are enabled for each user, and the number of enabled operations performed by users to whom the content and application rights have been distributed (col. 3, line 49 through col. 4, line 35).

As per claims 26 and 51, Schull teaches of providing a user software application further comprises providing an application rights management module in the user software application, the application rights management module being operable to detect whether a context exists in which one or more disabled operations have been made available; and instruct the user software application to enable the operation within the context; and wherein distributing the user software application further comprises distributing the application rights management module to one or more of the users (col. 3, line 49 through col. 4, line 35).

As per claim 52, Schull discloses of a method for providing and using configurable, context-dependent user software application, comprising: providing a

user software application including a set of disabled operations; providing a content generation tool, the content generation tool being operable to generate content and application rights information for the content in a format compatible with the user software application; distributing the user software application to one or more users; distributing the content generation tool to one or more content providers; generating content in a format compatible with a user software application and capable of being operated on by one or more of the disabled operations in the set of disabled operations; generating application rights information for the content operable to enable an operation in the set of disabled operations to operate on content within a context specified in the application rights information; distributing the content and the application rights information to one or more users; receiving the generated content; receiving the application rights information; enabling the operation in the set of disabled operations to operate on the received content; and performing the enabled operation on the received content using the user software application (col. 3, line 49 through col. 4, line 35).

Conclusion

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher Revak
Primary Examiner
AU 2131

CR

October 31, 2005